

**AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:**

The attached four sheets of drawings include changes to Figures 2, 4, and 6. Figure 9 has been deleted. These sheets, which include figures 1-8, replace the previously presented sheets including Figures 1-9. Figures 2, 4, and 6 have been amended while Figure 9 has been deleted. The proposed amended drawing sheets are attached.

**ATTACHMENTS:**

Four proposed replacement sheets.

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS:**

Claim 3 has been amended. Claims 5, 8, 15, 18, and 20 have been cancelled without prejudice. The specification has been amended. The drawings have been amended. Claims 2, 3, 7, 9, 10, 18, 21, and 22 remain in the application.

The drawings were rejected under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a). Applicant has amended the drawings to show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. No new matter has been entered into the amended drawings. Applicant has attached proposed amended drawings showing the changes to the drawings. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the drawings overcome the objection under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a) because of informalities and it is respectfully requested that the objection be removed.

The drawings were also objected to for including new matter in a previous amendment. Applicant has deleted Figure 9. With regards to Figures 1-8, it is respectfully submitted that the drawings as previously submitted do not constitute new matter as they are all properly supported by the specification or claims as originally filed.

With reference to Figure 2, Applicant has amended Figure 2 to remove the line thus clearly showing the panels being attached to the door rather than the vehicle body.

With regards to Figures 3 and 4 the specification clearly supports figures 3 and 4 at page 6 lines 8-13. It is irrelevant as to which door the Applicant makes wider as one skilled in the art would immediately recognize, based on the specification, that either the right door or the left door could be wider and in fact which door is wider does not effect the design or the operation of such doors. It should also be noted that the specification need only describe the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art and that not every last detail is to be described or else patent specifications would turn into production specifications, which they were never intended to be. Furthermore, a patent is not a

scientific treaty but a document that presumes the readership skills in the field of the invention. The technology of the present invention is not overly sophisticated and a person skilled in the art would clearly find support in the specification for Figures 3 and 4.

Regarding Figures 5, 6, 7 and 8 the same arguments given above for Figures 3 and 4 apply to Figures 5-8. Furthermore, the specification reasonably describes the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art who is familiar with brackets and hinges which are used on trucks. Therefore, the specification and the claims as originally filed properly support the drawings as added in the previous amendment. As the law states that every last detail and specific embodiment need not be described in the patent specification, such a ruling applies to the present case as one skilled in the art would easily recognize that figures 5 - 8 are properly supported by the original specification and claims as originally filed.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Figures 1-8, as amended, are acceptable and do not constitute new matter and it is respectfully requested that the drawings be accepted as having proper support in the specification and claims as originally filed.

The drawings were objected to as failing to comply with 37 C.F.R. 1.84(p)(4) because reference character 23 was used as both a hinge and a fastener. Applicant has corrected the drawing sheets so that reference character 23 only designates a fastener. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the drawings overcome the objection under 37 C.F.R. 1.84(p)(4) and it is respectfully requested that the objection be removed.

The specification was objected to under 35 U.S.C. § 132 because it introduces new matter into the disclosure. Applicant has amended the disclosure to remove “the

attachment of the panel is not limited by Figures 7 and 8 as the attachment means can be secured to the roof, bumper, vehicle sides, or any other suitable location". It is respectfully submitted that the specification, as amended, overcomes the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 132 and it is respectfully requested that the objection be removed.

Claim 3 was objected to because of informalities. Applicant has amended claim 3 to correct the informalities. It is respectfully submitted that claim 3, as amended, overcomes the objection because of informalities and it is respectfully requested that the objection be removed.

Claims 3, 7, 18, 19, 21 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claim 19 has been cancelled without prejudice. It is respectfully submitted that claims 3, 7, 18, 21 and 22 are allowable for the same reasons given above for objected Figures 1-8. Furthermore, the subject matter of these claims was properly illustrated and described in enough detail in the specification and amended drawings to allow a person skilled in the art to realize the Applicant had possession of the invention at the time of filing. It is clear to a person skilled in the art that the inventor had complete and full possession of the claimed invention at the time the application was filed. Also, the claim language of the rejected claims is either exactly found or inferred in the original specification and thus clearly, even without figures, supports the written description requirement for claims 3, 7, 18, 21 and 22. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 3, 7, 18, 21, and 22 overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph and are allowable over this rejection.

Claim 15 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Norfleet. Claim 20 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Norfleet. Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Norfleet in



view of Poutney. Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Norfleet in view of Rumbarger. Applicant has cancelled claims 5, 8, 15, and 20 without prejudice. Therefore, the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and § 103 have become moot.

Claims 2, 9, and 10 are allowed.

If the Applicant can be of any further assistance or provide any other information in the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at 248-364-2100.

Respectfully Submitted,

RAGGIO & DINNIN, P.C.

Date: May 20, 2005

Michael T. Raggio  
Raggio & Dinnin, P.C.  
2701 Cambridge Court, Suite 410  
Auburn Hills, Michigan 48326  
*Attorney for Applicant*

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

I hereby certify that this paper (along with any paper referred to as being attached or deposited) is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as Express Mail (EV 525155523 US) in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on May 20, 2005

By:   
Michelle Keydel